

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

Amended claims reflect re-wording consistent with the specification and previously presented claims. The amendments are intended to be directed to matters of form, and are not intended to restrict claim scope.

Applicants appreciate claims 25 and 26 are allowed.

Please reconsider and allow claims 29-32.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 33 related to boat hulls or boat decks, and they do so now, which structure is simply not disclosed in or suggested by the cited Akimoto reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,986,860). There is no basis for ignoring claim language. The language is in the claims and was previously in the claims. This is not a situation remotely relevant to the Examiner's case citation to In re Van Geuns.

Claims 2 and 35 related to boat hulls or boat decks before this Amendment as do they now after this Amendment. This is nowhere addressed in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Akimoto (USP 4,986,860) further in view of Steward (USP 4,211,590) or Stamper (USP 4,256,797). These references are only cited with respect to vehicle trim, and that is remote from and would not have suggested the claimed inventions.

Claims 9 and 10 related to a boat deck or a boat hull before this Amendment, as do they now after this Amendment. These claimed inventions would have been unobvious over Akimoto (USP 4,986,860) when taken further in view of Fay (USP 4,053,545). Neither reference pertains to marine utilities, nor is either suggestive of a boat hull or boat deck. The Akimoto reference is further more silent about an acrylic adhesive. Therefore, even if they would have been combined, which is not conceded, their combined teachings would not have suggested a boat hull on a boat deck.

Claims 10, 11, 13-15 and 35 selected to boat hulls or boat decks before this Amendment, as they do now after this Amendment. The Office Action does not address this claim language, but nonetheless rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Akimoto reference (USP 4,986,860) in view of Steward (USP 4,211,590) or Stamper (USP 4,256,797) and further in view of Fay (USP 4,053,545). No reference would have suggested a boat hull or boat deck. The Akimoto reference does not disclose the use of an acrylic adhesive. The Steward reference does

not disclose the use of an acrylic adhesive. The Fay reference does not disclose the use of an acrylic adhesive. The Fay reference does not pertain to boat hulls, boat decks or marine utilities (structure of marine vessels, etc.). Therefore, it is simply not seen, except via impermissible hindsight and by ignoring claim language, which is there any basis for this rejection.

Corrected drawings are being filed concurrently herewith.

This case is ready for allowance, and notice to such effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

By: Ramon R Hoch

Kendrew H. Colton
Registration No. 30,368

Ramon R. Hoch
Registration No. 34,108

Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery
1801 K Street, N.W.
Suite 401L
Washington, D.C. 20006-1201
Telephone No. (202) 419-7000
Facsimile No. (202) 419-7007